



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,923	06/21/2007	Daniel J. Rader		5393
51414	7590	09/23/2010	EXAMINER	
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP			WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E	
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR				
53 STATE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
EXCHANGE PLACE				1614
BOSTON, MA 02109-2881				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/23/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTBOS@GOODWINPROCTER.COM
GLENN.WILLIAMS@GOODWINPROCTER.COM
HMCPEAKE@GOODWINPROCTER.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/591,923	RADER, DANIEL J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KEVIN WEDDINGTON	1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8,9,16,18 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8,9 and 26 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16, 18, 27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

The finality of the Office action dated July 26, 2010 is hereby withdrawn so that new rejections can be made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 16, 18 and 26-28 are presented for examination.

Applicant's amendment and response filed September 13, 2010 have been received and entered.

The declaration filed April 14, 2010 has been acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office action dated July 26, 2010 on page 2.

Accordingly, the rejection made under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gregg et al. (5,883,109) as set forth in the previous Office action dated July 26, 2010 at pages 2-3 as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 8, 16 and 18 is hereby withdrawn because the cited reference does not teach every limitation suggested by the applicants.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 26 are allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a written description rejection.

A lack of adequate written description issue arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); In re Ruschig, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967).

An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.

In particular, the specification as original filed fails to provide sufficient written bases of any of the agents demonstrating wherein possession of use of the broad terms: **HMG CoA reductase inhibitors, cholesterol absorption inhibitors, squalene synthetase inhibitors, fibrates, bile acid sequestrants, statins, thiazolidinediones and cholesterol ester transfer protein (CTEP) inhibitors**. The mere fact that Applicant may have discovered one type of HMG CoA reductase inhibitor, cholesterol absorption inhibitor, squalene synthetase inhibitor, fibrate, bile acid sequestrant, statin,

thiazolidinedione and cholesterol ester transfer protein (CTEP) inhibitor combined with MTP inhibitor of formula I is not sufficient to claim the entire genus.

The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. See Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

A "representative number of species" means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure "indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us]."

Claims 16 and 18 are not allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregg et al. (5,883,109) in view of Rosenblum et al. (5,767,115).

Gregg et al. teach the use of a MTP inhibitor, 9-[4-[-[[2-(2,2,2-trifluoroethoxy)benzoyl]amino]-1-piperidinyl]butyl-N-(2,2,2-trifluoroethyl)-9H-flourene-9-carboxamide, is effective in treating hyperlipidemia and hypercholesterolemia. Note column 21, lines 25-67 to column 22, lines 1-63 shows the other cholesterol lowering agents can be administered with the MTP inhibitor. Note column 23, lines 12-15 shows the dosage range of from about 0.01 mg/kg to about 100 mg/kg, wherein applicant's dosage range of about 2 to about 13 mg/day falls within the cited reference's range. Note column 23, lines 50-54 shows the combination of the MTP inhibitor and the other cholesterol lowering agents can be administered in the dosage from as described in single or divided doses of one to four times daily. It may be advisable to start a patient on a low dose combination and work up gradually to a high dose combination. Finally, note column 24, lines 47-55 shows the combination will be administered for a prolonged period such as biweekly, weekly, monthly and the like may also be employed.

The instant invention differs from the cited reference in that the cited reference does not teach the applicant's preferred second agent, ezetimibe. However, the secondary reference, Rosenblum et al., teaches ezetimibe as a well-known agent for lowering cholesterol levels. Clearly, one skilled in the art would have assumed the substitution of one cholesterol lowering agent in place of another cholesterol lowering agent in the primary reference would be obvious with a predictable expectation of successful treatment due to the agents' functional similarities.

Claims 27 and 28 are not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN WEDDINGTON whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:30 pm - 9:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KEVIN WEDDINGTON
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

/KEVIN WEDDINGTON/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614